

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/573,222	03/23/2006	Daniel Raederstorff	22212USWO C038435/0196793	4962	
7590 05/18/2007 Stephen M Haracz			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Bryan Cave 1290 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10104			ANDERSON	ANDERSON, HEATHER L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New Tork, IV	New 101k, N1 10104				
	·		· MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/573,222	RAEDERSTORFF ET AL.			
		Examiner .	Art Unit			
		Heather Anderson	1609			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timusely and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 M	arch 2006.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7 and 19 and 20, drawn to method of making a nutraceutical composition comprising a catechin and a PPAR γ ligand.

Group II, claim(s) 8 – 13, drawn to a method of treating diabetes and/or obesity and syndrome X comprising consuming a catechin during administration of a PPARγ ligand.

Group III, claim(s) 14 – 18, drawn to a composition comprising a catechin and a PPARγ ligand.

A "special technical feature" is defined in PCT rule 13.2 as "those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." The inventions listed as Groups I – III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reason. Isoda et al (Japanese patent publication 02-243622, published September 9, 1990) teaches the same technical feature that defines the invention of a composition comprising a catechin and EPA or DHA, which are PPARγ ligands (see abstract cited in Applicant's IDS). Since the invention as broadly claimed does not contain a special technical feature, unity of invention is lacking.

Art Unit: 1609

Groups I and III contain claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- A. Full agonist
- B. Partial agonist
- C. Selective PPARy modulator/agonist
- D. PPARy dual agonist or panagonist
- E. Thiazolidinedione
- F. PUFA
- G. Lugistilide
- H. Phytanic acid

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

A-D: Claim 2 (Group I)

E: Claims 3 and 19 (Group I), claims 14 and 16 (Group III)

F: Claims 5 (Group I) and 20 (Group III)

G: Claim 6 (Group I)

Application/Control Number: 10/573,222

Art Unit: 1609

H: Claim 7 (Group I)

The following claim(s) are generic:

A-D: Claim 1 (Group I)

E, G and H: Claim 1 (Group I) and claim 14 (Group III)

F: Claims 1 and 4 (Group I)

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the for the same reason as given above.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

Art Unit: 1609

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather Anderson whose telephone number is (571) 270-3051. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30 AM-5:00 PM, ALT. Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mary Mosher can be reached on (571) 272-0906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MARY MOSHER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

hla